

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

MAHIN SAEID,

Plaintiff,

v.

CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-01826-APG-PAL

**ORDER DENYING LEAVE TO AMEND
COMPLAINT AND TO MOTION TO
EXTEND TRIAL SETTING**

(Dkt. Nos. 51, 56)

Presently before the Court are Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint [Dkt. #51] and Motion to Continue Trial Setting and to Extend Discovery Motion Deadlines [Dkt. #56].

On October 4, 2013, Magistrate Judge Leen denied Plaintiff's Motion to Extend the Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order [Dkt. #49], which is identical to Plaintiff's current Motion to Extend the Trial Date [Dkt. #56]. Judge Leen properly analyzed the appropriate factors in rendering her decision. There is no reason to render a decision different from Magistrate Judge Leen's Order. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Continue Trial is hereby DENIED.

Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint [Dkt. #51] does not comply with Local Rule 15-1 and is untimely. Plaintiff failed to attach to her Motion the proposed Amended Complaint, as required by Local Rule 15-1. This alone requires the Court to deny the Motion to Amend. *United States v. 3 Parcels In La Plata County, Colorado*, 919 F. Supp. 1449, 1457 (D. Nev. 1995). Moreover, Plaintiff's Motion is untimely. Pursuant to the Scheduling Order issued by Magistrate Judge Leen, the last date to amend

1 pleadings and add parties expired on February 6, 2013 [Dkt. #29]. Judge Leen's
2 subsequent Amended Scheduling Order (which did not extend the deadlines for adding
3 parties) stated that further motions to extend discovery deadlines "must be made not
4 later than 20 days before the discovery cutoff date, meaning on or before Saturday,
5 August 17, 2013, and comply fully with L.R. 26-4." [Dkt. #42]. Finally, Judge Leen wrote
6 that "no further extensions will be allowed absent a strong showing of good cause and
7 that the parties could not complete discovery within the extend time allowed despite the
8 exercise of due diligence." (*Id.*)

9 Plaintiff's Motion was filed well beyond the February 6, 2013 deadline. Rather, it
10 was filed one day before the extended deadline for completion of all discovery. Plaintiff
11 has not offered sufficient facts to justify "a strong showing of good cause and ... due
12 diligence" to justify an extension of the deadline.

13 For all the foregoing reasons,

14 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint
15 [Dkt. #51] is **DENIED**.

16 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Continue Trial Setting and to
17 Extend Discovery and Motion Deadlines [Dkt. #56] is **DENIED**.

18 Dated: November 4, 2013.



19
20 **ANDREW P. GORDON**
21 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**
22
23
24
25
26
27
28